

Appl. No. 10/664,560
Docket No. 9364
Amdt. dated June 30, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed on March 31, 2010
Customer No. 27752

REMARKS

Claim Status

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 14, and 15 are pending in the present application. No additional claims fee is believed to be due.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. Patent No. 3,960,272 and U.S. Patent No. 3,912,571

Claims 1, 2, 10-12, 14, and 15 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over U.S. Patent No. 3,960,272 to Hartbauer, et al. ("Hartbauer I") and U.S. Patent No. 3,912,571 Hartbauer, et al. ("Hartbauer II") (collectively referred to as "Hartbauer"). The Examiner asserts that Hartbauer in Figs. 11-14 teaches a rolled multi-ply product having a tail portion, wherein a fold is formed in the tail portion that constitutes a tail end for grasping by a consumer. The Examiner further asserts that the change in location of the consumer accessible tab within the same general location as the prior art tab and performing the same function as the prior art tab constitutes no more than an unpatentable rearrangement of parts. MPEP 2144.04.

Applicants respectfully disagree with the Examiner's position that the claimed invention is merely a rearrangement of parts in the prior art. Applicants submit that MPEP 2144.04 also states that "The mere fact that a worker in the art could rearrange the parts of the reference device to meet the terms of the claims on appeal is not itself sufficient to support a finding of obviousness. The prior art must provide a motivation or reason for the worker in the art, without the benefit of appellant's specification, to make the necessary changes in the reference device." *Ex parte Chicago Rawhide Mfg. Co.*, 223 USPQ 351, 353 (Bd. Pat. App. & Inter. 1984). Applicants submit that Hartbauer provides no motivation or reason to rearrange its parts to arrive at the claimed invention. Hartbauer teaches a manually graspable fold in its product. Applicants submit that Hartbauer's fold cannot be properly rearranged to arrive at the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Hartbauer. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 10-12, and 14-15, which

Appl. No. 10/664,560
Docket No. 9364
Amdt. dated June 30, 2010
Reply to Office Action mailed on March 31, 2010
Customer No. 27752

ultimately depend from Claim 1, are not rendered obvious over Hartbauer. MPEP 2143.03.

Rejection Under 35 USC §103(a) Over U.S. Patent Nos. 3,960,272 and 3,912,571 and
further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,924,042

Claims 1-2, 10-12, and 14-15 are rejected by the Examiner under 35 USC §103(a) as allegedly defining obvious subject matter over Hartbauer, discussed above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,924,042 to Von Paleske (“Von Paleske”).

Applicants respectfully submit that Hartbauer in view of Von Paleske fails to teach each and every element of Claim 1, the independent claim, because Hartbauer’s parts of its product including its graspable fold cannot properly be rearranged to produce the claimed invention. Applicants further submit that Von Paleske’s teachings fail to overcome the deficiencies of Hartbauer. Accordingly, Applicants submit that Claim 1 is not rendered obvious over Hartbauer in view of Von Paleske. MPEP 2143.03. Further, Applicants submit that Claims 2, 10-12, and 14-15, which ultimately depend from Claim 1, are not rendered obvious over Hartbauer in view of Von Paleske. MPEP 2143.03.

Conclusion

This response represents an earnest effort to place the present application in proper form and to distinguish the invention as claimed from the applied reference(s). In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of this application, and allowance of the pending claim(s) are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

THE PROCTER & GAMBLE COMPANY

By /C. Brant Cook/
Signature
C. Brant Cook
Registration No. 39,151
(513) 983-1004

Date: June 30, 2010
Customer No. 27752